

## Instructions for Proposal Evaluation

These instructions have been prepared to assist with completion of the Proposal Evaluation Form for the City of John Day, Oregon, Wastewater System Improvements - 2019 Membrane Bioreactor Equipment Procurement. The purpose of these instructions is to aid each evaluator with evaluating the submitted proposals so each evaluation is based on a common standard. Following these guidelines will aid in providing more comparable evaluations from each evaluator.

Each scoring criterion established in the Request for Proposals (RFP) package is outlined below with a brief explanation of the criterion and subcategories provided to aid in evaluation. These criteria outlined below are not all-inclusive; each evaluator may have additional thoughts or concerns when considering each criterion.

1. Life Cycle Cost: The total anticipated cost the City will pay for the packaged membrane bioreactor (MBR) system during 20 years of service. The life cycle cost includes initial Capital Cost, Operating Costs, Maintenance Costs, and Replacement Costs.
  - a. Capital Cost
    - i. Initial cost to purchase, install, construct, and provide any services required to provide a complete and operational system.
  - b. Operating Cost
    - i. Costs involved with the day-to-day operation of the system. Should include power costs, at a minimum, and may also include chemical costs, if applicable.
  - c. Maintenance Cost
    - i. Costs involved with regular maintenance activities, including labor, supplies, and materials.
  - d. Replacement Cost
    - i. Costs for the replacement of all rotating parts, along with the replacement costs for the membranes and diffusers.
  
2. Reliability: The reliability of the system to meet the effluent requirements established in the RFP. Reliability may be determined based on the Proposer's experience/history with similarly sized packaged MBR facilities, references provided by the Proposer, and longevity of the provided equipment.
  - a. Experience/History
    - i. Has the Proposer provided multiple similarly sized packaged MBR facilities in the past to other clients?
    - ii. How many similarly sized facilities has the Proposer provided in the past?
  - b. References
    - i. How many references from past installations has the Proposer provided?
    - ii. Are the references positive?
  - c. Longevity
    - i. What kind of warranties are provided with the equipment?
    - ii. How long have similarly sized facilities been in service?

- iii. Have any of the references mentioned the need for premature replacement of any components?

3. Ease of Operation

- a. To what extent is the proposed system automated?
- b. What are the anticipated manpower requirements to operate the system?
- c. What level of support is offered by the Proposer both during startup and throughout the lifecycle of the facility?
- d. How close is the Proposer located to the facility site? Will site visits be feasible throughout the lifecycle of the facility if needed?

4. Ease of Maintenance

- a. Are proposed components and equipment easily accessible for maintenance?
- b. What are the anticipated manpower requirements to maintain the system?
- c. Are replacement parts easily acquired?
- d. What level of support is offered by the Proposer both during startup and throughout the lifecycle of the facility?
- e. How close is the Proposer located to the facility site? Will site visits be feasible throughout the lifecycle of the facility if needed?

